

Atty. Docket No.: YOR920030442US1
Response to Office Action of October 15, 2009
Amendment for January 15, 2010
Appl. No.: 10/725,735

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 and 51-60 were cancelled in a previous amendment. Claims 31-50, and 61-67 are currently pending. Claims 31, 41, 49, 61, 66 and 67 are amended via this paper. No new matter has been added by any of the foregoing amendments.

In the Final Office Action mailed on October 15, 2009 the Office rejects claims 31-50 and 61-67. Specifically, the Office rejects claims 41-50 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failing to specify statutory subject matter. Maintaining a traversal, and not conceding the correctness of the Office's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101, Applicant respectfully amends the preamble of claim 41 to address the Office's §101 rejection and expedite prosecution of the presented claims on the merits. Dependent claims 42-50 ultimately depend from claim 41, respectfully, and Applicant's amendment to claim 41 similarly renders the Office's rejection of claims 42-50 under 35 U.S.C. §101 moot.

The Office rejects claims 66 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office states that the claims 66 and 67 are indefinite via their use of the terms "local" and "remote" respectively. Applicant respectfully traverses. However, in an attempt to move the prosecution forward, without conceding the correctness of the rejections, Applicant respectfully amends claims 66 and 67 by removing and replacing the language rejected as indefinite.

The Office rejects claims 31-35, 39, 41-45, 49 and 61-67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious and therefore unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,243,740 issued to Minneman (hereinafter "*Minneman*") in view of U.S. Published Patent

Atty. Docket No.: YOR920030442US1
Response to Office Action of October 15, 2009
Amendment for January 15, 2010
Appl. No.: 10/725,735

PATENT

Application 2002/0178442 A1 by Williams (hereinafter "*Williams*"), in further view. Of U.S. Patent 6,947,966 issued to Oko (hereinafter "*Oko*"). The Office also rejects claims 36-38, 40, 46-48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious and therefore unpatentable over *Minneman* in view of *Williams* in further view of *Oko*, in further view of U.S. Patent 5,400,248 issued to Chisholm (hereinafter "*Chisholm*"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

However, in an attempt to move the prosecution forward, and in view of the Examiners' Note set fourth in the Final Office Action, without conceding the correctness of the rejections, Applicant respectfully amends claims 31, 41, 49 and 61 to overcome these rejections.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the above amendments and favorable action on the merits is requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments or otherwise deem that prosecution of the present application may be advanced, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,
CAHN & SAMUELS, L.L.P.

By: /Chester L. Jordan II/
Chester L. Jordan II, Esq.
Reg. No. 42,699
CAHN & SAMUELS, LLP
1100 17th Street N.W. Suite 401
Washington, DC 20036-6924
Telephone No.: 202-331-8777
Facsimile No.: 202-331-3838

January 15, 2010